

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated May 10, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on August 10, 2005. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Specification

In the specification, paragraph 1 has been amended to insert prior art document serial numbers as requested by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 8-10, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Patent No. 6,574,015 to *Tselikov et al.* (hereinafter "*Tselikov*").

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Further, the elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Claims 1, 8 and 15 recite the limitation of first and second reflectors coupled to an output of a beam combiner (or means for combining two light beams) to form an interferometer with the reflectors spaced from one another to provide an interference signal. In contrast to an interferometer having two reflectors, *Tselikov et al.* discloses propagating a light signal through an optical fiber and reflecting off of a magneto-optical media. This failure of *Tselikov et al.* to teach each and every element in claims 1, 8 and 15 precludes *Tselikov et al.* from anticipating these claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1, 8 and 15 and claims 2, 3, 8-10 and 16 dependent thereon.

Page 8

387423_1.DOC

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4-7 and 11-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, Applicants have added new claims 17-20 that correspond to previous claims 4-7 written in independent form. Further, Applicants submit that claims 4-7 and 11-14 are patentable based at least on the traversal presented above regarding the independent claims from which they depend.

Conclusion

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicants' disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicants believe that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

The references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Randol W. Read
Registration No. 43,876
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants

Page 9

357423_1.DOC